

PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT FOR PUBLIC SECTOR OPERATIONS (PCR)



AFRICAN
DEVELOPMENT
BANK GROUP

AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK GROUP



NACALA ROAD CORRIDOR STUDIES - Design and Legal Framework for Zambia/Malawi and Malawi/Mozambique One Stop Border Posts (OSBP)

PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT (PCR)

PICU DEPARTMENT

November 2018

I BASIC DATA

A Report data

| | | | |
|-------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Report date | Date of report: | November 30 th 2018 | |
| | Mission date (if field mission) | From: 17 September 2018 | To: 22 September 2018 |

B Responsible Bank staff

| Positions | At approval | At completion |
|------------------------|----------------|--|
| Regional Director | Ojukwu Chiji | Josephine Ngure |
| Country Manager | | |
| Sector Director | Alex Rugamba | A. Oumarou |
| Sector Manager | Bamory Traore | M. Salawou |
| Task Manager | Mtchera Chirwa | Mtchera Chirwa |
| Alternate Task Manager | | |
| PCR Team Leader | | Guy Manouan (consultant) |
| PCR Team Members | | Guy Manouan (consultant); Codo Pamphile; Epifani Carvalho; Janet Okero |
| Peer Reviewers | | Davies Makasa, Richard Malinga, Rosemary Sunkuntu |

C Project data

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Project name: NACALA ROAD CORRIDOR STUDIES - Design and Legal Framework for Zambia/Malawi and Malawi/Mozambique One Stop Border Posts (OSBP) | | |
| Project Code : P-Z1-DB0-080 | Instrument number(s): NEPAD-IPPF GRANT No. 5150155000051 | |
| Project type: Preparation Study | Sector: TRANSPORT | |
| Country: Malawi, Mozambique & Zambia | Environmental categorization (1-3): 3 | |
| Processing milestones – Bank approved financing only (add/delete rows depending on the number of financing sources) | Key Events (Bank approved financing only) | Disbursement and closing dates (Bank approved financing only) |
| Financing source/ instrument1: NEPAD-IPPF GRANT | Financing source/ instrument1: NEPAD-IPPF GRANT | Financing source/ instrument1: |
| Date approved: : 25 November, 2009 | Cancelled amounts: USD 367,120.37 | Original disbursement deadline: 31 st June, 2012 |
| Date signed: 13 September, 2011 | Supplementary financing: N/A | Original closing date: 31 st June, 2012 |
| Date of entry into force: 13 th September, 2011 | Restructuring (specify date & amount involved): N/A | Revised (if applicable) disbursement deadline: 27 February, 2013, 1 July 2014, 9 March 2015, 1 June 2015 |
| Date effective for 1st disbursement: 13 September 2011 | Extensions (specify dates): | Revised (if applicable) closing date: As above |
| Date of actual 1st disbursement: | | |

| 27 th July, 2015 | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Financing source/instrument (add/delete rows depending on the number of financing sources): | Disbursed amount (amount, USD): | Percentage disbursed (%): | Undisbursed amount (USD): | Percentage undisbursed (%): |
| Financing source/ instrument1: | 122,569.31 | 34 | 238,659.69 | 66 |
| Financing source/ instrument2: | | | | |
| Government: | | - | - | - |
| Beneficiaries | - | - | - | - |
| Other (e.g. co-financiers): | - | - | - | - |
| TOTAL | 122,569.31 | 34 | 238,659.69 | 66 |
| Financing source/instrument (add/delete rows depending on the number of financing sources): | Committed amount, (USD): | Percentage committed (%): | Uncommitted amount (USD): | Percentage uncommitted (%): |
| Financing source/ instrument1: | 361,229.00 | | - | - |
| Financing source/ instrument2: | | | | |
| Government: | | | - | - |
| Other (eg. co-financiers). | 193,679.50 | | | |
| TOTAL | 554,908.50 | | - | |
| Co-financiers and other external partners: DFID Mozambique Regional Gateway Programme (MRGP) | | | | |
| Executing and implementing agency (ies): SADC Secretariat | | | | |

D Management review and comments

| Report reviewed by | Name | Date reviewed | Comments |
|--------------------|----------------|---------------|----------|
| Country Manager | | | |
| Sector Manager | Mike Salawou | | |
| Director General | Kapil Kapoor | | |
| Sector Director | Amadou Oumarou | | |

II Project performance assessment

A Relevance

i) Relevance of project development objective

| Rating* | Narrative assessment (max 250 words) |
|---------|---|
| 4 | The objectives of the project were to facilitate trade between countries in southern and eastern Africa so that the economies of the region become more competitive in international trade and people benefit through job creation and increased wealth, among other benefits. These objectives were extremely relevant as the preparation of a framework for extra territorial operation of one-stop border posts between Mozambique and Malawi and Malawi and Zambia of developing and implementing regional transport infrastructures would facilitate higher trade activities along the corridor, improve efficiency in cross border trade and support economic growth. |

* For all ratings in the PCR use the following scale: 4 (Highly satisfactory), 3 (Satisfactory), 2 (Unsatisfactory), 1 (Highly unsatisfactory)

ii) Relevance of project design

| Rating* | Narrative assessment (max 250 words) |
|---------|--|
| 4 | <p>The design of the studies was that the Grant financing would be provided to SADC Secretariat in their role as the Regional Economic Community promoting regional Intergration and to coordinate the develop of the OSBPs with the 3 countries. This was a much better proposition that having an individual country to manage. During the project appraisal stage, the Bank / NEPAD-IPPF and the SADC Secretariat agreed on an organizational structure where oversight of the studies would be done by a Joint Steering Committee (JSC) comprising representatives from the Ministries responsible for transport in Mozambique, Malawi and Zambia and the Chief Executive Officers of the Roads Agencies the three countries under the Chairmanship of the Director of Infrastructure at the SADC Secretariat. the Director of Infrastructure at the SADC Secretariat being responsible for the day-to-day management and monitoring of the activities being undertaken by a competetlively recruited consultancy services firm.</p> <p>This design and implementation structure benefited from lessons learnt from previous Bank interventions in transport sector in the three countries as well as in the Southern Africa region.</p> |

iii) Lessons learned related to relevance

| Key issues (max 5, add rows as needed) | Lessons learned | Target audience |
|---|--|--------------------------------|
| 1. Implementation arrangements | <p>Despite that the implementation arrangements as designed with SADC Secretariat to coordinate the studies and consensus building with the 3 Member countries; the actual implementation proved problematic as SADC Secretariat had not allocated sufficient budget and a dedicated person within its Infrastructure Directorate to ensure an effective delivery of this role. Additionally, as the contribution to the project from the Member Countries was to be own resources for participation in validation meetings and workshops as well as for review and clearance of reports, it proved to be problematic for all the 3 countries to meet timely and as required often times due to unavailability of funds and key people required at specific times. As a result, implementation progress was significantly affected leading to significant delays in the delivery schedule.</p> <p>Key lesson is to allocate a dedicated budget and assign specific individuals to be charged with the responsibility of pushing progress on the project.</p> | Bank, SADC Secretaria and RMCs |

B Effectiveness

1. Progress towards the project's development objective (project purpose)

| Comments |
|--|
| <p><i>Provide a brief description of the Project (components) and the context in which it was designed and implemented. State the project development objective (usually the project purpose as set out in the RLF) and assess progress. Unanticipated outcomes should also be accounted for, as well as specific reference of gender equality in the project . The consistency of the assumptions that link the different levels of the results chain in the RLF should also be considered. Indicative max length: 400 words.</i></p> |
| <p>The objectives of the project are to facilitate trade between countries in southern and eastern Africa so that the economies of the region become more competitive in international trade and people benefit through job creation and increased wealth, among other benefits.</p> <p>The preparatory activities funded under the NEPAD-IPPF grant were mainly studies whose reports made recommendations to contribute to producing the anticipated development impacts. These activities were capured in two components: Component A - To determine the best technical, economic, environmental and socio-economic options for One stop border posts between Mozambique and Malawi and between Malawi and Zambia; Component B - To prepare a legal framework for extra territorial operation of one-stop border posts.</p> |

By the time the project was cancelled, some deliverables intended had been submitted and accepted. However, as the studies were to be implemented to their conclusion under this Grant, progress towards achieving the intended project objectives was hampered.

The one positive outcome was that the reports that were delivered under this Grant were then taken into a follow up phase in the implementation of the Bank's support for the development of NACALA Corridor Phase IV under ADF financing which used the outputs and input into design review and implementation phase.

2. Outcome reporting

| Outcome indicators (as per RLF; add more rows as needed) | Baseline value (Year) | Most recent value (A) | End target (B) (expected value at project completion) | Progress towards target (% realized) (A/B) | Narrative assessment (indicative max length: 50 words per outcome) | Core Sector Indicator (Yes/No) |
|---|---|-----------------------|---|---|---|--------------------------------|
| 1. Feasibility and economic viability on OSBPs between Mozambique and Malawi and between Malawi and Zambia | None | None | Built | 50% for the Malawi Zambia but 0% for Malawi Mozambique | Implementation of the Malawi/Zambia OSBP along the Nacala Corridor is progressing under ADF financing. The Malawi/Mozambique OSBP was shelved to a future time. | No |
| 2. Enlightened decision making concerning a legal framework for extra territorial operation one-stop border posts | None | None | Decision to proceed with implementation | 100% decision on the Malawi Zambia but 0% for Malawi Mozambique | The outcome of the studies from this Grant have provided knowledge and information that has enabled the Member Countries to make a positive decision to proceed with implementation of OSBPs along the Nacala Corridor. | No |
| Rating* (see IPR methodology) | Narrative assessment | | | | | |
| 2 | The progress towards the main Outcomes of the project is not satisfactory as the implementation of the studies from this Grant took too long to deliver outputs and even then did not fully conclude the assignment leading to cancellation. Also, only one of the two OSBPs that were targeted by this Grant is going ahead currently. Average rating for the Outcome is unsatisfactory. | | | | | |

3. Output reporting

| Output indicators (as specified in the RLF; add more rows as needed) | Most recent value (A) | End target (B) (expected value at project completion) | Progress towards target (% realized) (A/B) | Narrative assessment (indicative max length: 50 words per output) | Core Sector Indicator (Yes/No) |
|--|-----------------------|---|--|---|--------------------------------|
| Feasibility, Preliminary design and Final design reports and bidding documents for the OSBPs | Partially delivered | Complete feasibility reports, design & tender documents | 75 % | Some of the required reports were completed and handed over to the Borrower. However, due to significant delays by the consultants to complete the assignment, the Grant was cancelled and their contract was terminated for no-performance. So not all the outputs were delivered as required. | N/A |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|------|---|
| Draft Legislative Documentation for extra-territorial operation of the one-stop border posts | Partially delivered | Complete Draft Legislative Documentation for extra-territorial operation of the one-stop border posts | 45 % | Some of the required reports were completed and handed over to the Borrower. However, due to significant delays by the consultants to complete the assignment, the Grant was cancelled and their contract was terminated for no-performance. So not all the outputs were delivered as required. |
| Rating*(see IPR methodology) | Narrative assessment | | | |
| 2 | Not all the required outputs were delivered as required and the contract was terminated. Unsatisfactory. | | | |

4. Development Objective (DO) rating

| | |
|--|--|
| DO rating (derived from updated IPR)* | Narrative assessment (indicative max length: 250 words) |
| 2 | <p>The project development objective is to facilitate trade between countries in southern and eastern Africa so that the economies of the region become more competitive in international trade and people benefit through job creation and increased wealth, among other benefits.</p> <p>The Objective was valid and successful implementation of the components under this project would have gone a long way towards contributing to its achievement. However, as the studies were not delivered fully and on time resulting in cancellation and termination of the consultants contract, this hampered the achievement of the DO, thus the unsatisfactory rating.</p> |

5. Beneficiaries (add rows as needed)

| Actual(A) | Planned(B) | Progress towards target (% realized) (A/B) | % of women | Category (eg. farmers, students) |
|---|--|--|------------|--|
| 1. Governments, citizens and business people of Malawi, Mozambique and Zambia | Governments, citizens and business people of Malawi, Mozambique and Zambia | <50% | - | Government agencies such as Revenue authorities, customs, border police, ordinary business people etc. |

6. Unanticipated or additional outcomes (add rows as needed)

| Description | Type (eg. gender, climate change, social, other) | Positive or negative | Impact on project (High, Medium, Low) |
|-------------|--|----------------------|---------------------------------------|
| None | None | None | None |

7. Lessons learned related to effectiveness (add rows as needed)

| Key issues (max 5, add rows as needed) | Lessons learned | Target audience |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|
|--|-----------------|-----------------|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 1. The design of the project, resources made available to implementation arrangements adopted have worked well in other similar projects and thus should have been effective. However, the project met many challenges and thus did not deliver, as required, on time nor to the standard expected. | 1. Ensure budget allocation for project management and coordination at SADC Secretariat the Executing Agency. 2. Ensure adequate capacity for close supervision and monitoring of the consultants at the Executing Agency. | Executing Agency (SADC) and the Bank (TMs) |
|---|---|--|

C Efficiency

1. Timeliness

| Planned project duration – years (A) (as per PAR) | Actual implementation time – years (B) (from effectiveness for 1st disb.) | Ratio of planned and actual implementation time (A/B) | Rating* |
|--|--|---|---------|
| 6 months | 54 months | 0.11 | 1 |

Highly unsatisfactory. The project did not start on time, took almost 2 years to be signed; procurement of consultants was delayed and delivery of outputs was continuously delayed resulting in multiple requests for extension, which the Bank provided considering its importance. However, in the end the project still had to be cancelled and the consultancy contract terminated for non performance.

2. Resource use efficiency

| Median % physical implementation of RLF outputs financed by all financiers (A) (see II.B.3) | Commitment rate (%) (B) (See table 1.C – Total commitment rate of all financiers) | Ratio of the median percentage physical implementation and commitment rate (A/B) | Rating* |
|--|--|--|---------|
| 75% | 34% | 2.21 | 1 |

Narrative assessment (indicative max length: 250 words)

Total financing provided amounted to USD 554,908.50 from both NEPAD-IPPF and DFID. However, at the time of cancellation, only 34% of the funds had been utilized and delivery of outputs is estimated at only 75% of what was expected despite the multiple time extensions. Therefore rated as *Highly Unsatisfactory*.

3. Cost benefit analysis

| Economic Rate of Return (at appraisal) | Updated Economic Rate of Return (at completion) | Rating* |
|--|---|---------|
| EIRR = N/A | EIRR = N/A | - |

Narrative assessment (indicative max length: 250 words)

As this is a study, cost benefit analyses does not apply, and will only come into play during the implementation of the physical rehabilitation and modernisation projects.

4. Implementation Progress (IP)

| IP Rating (derived from updated IPR) * | Narrative comments (commenting specifically on those IP items that were rated Unsatisfactory or Highly Unsatisfactory, as per last IPR). (indicative max length: 500 words) |
|---|---|
| 1 | The implementation progress rating for the project by the Bank was repeatedly poor and the project was regularly flagged for poor performance both in terms of disbursement rates and the number of extensions to the closing date. So it is overall rated highly unsatisfactory. |

5. Lessons learned related to efficiency

| Key issues (max 5, add rows as needed) | Lessons learned | Target audience |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|
|--|-----------------|-----------------|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Significant time overruns due to signature, procurement and output delivery delays | 1.The EA and the Bank should ensure that the EA has adequate financial and human capacity allocated specifically for managing the assignment and closely monitoring the consultants work. 2. Need to ensure contributions from RMCs towards their role in the project are set aside, ringfenced so that they effectively support execution of the project as intended. | 1.Executing Agency (SADC) and the Bank 2. Executing Agency (SADC), the Bank and RMCs |
| 2. Poor performance by the Consultants engaged for the services. | Need to vet consultant's competencies relevant to the assignment at hand very carefully to ensure their capability to deliver | Executing Agency (SADC) and the Bank |

D Sustainability

1. Financial sustainability

| Rating* | Narrative assessment (indicative max length: 250 words) |
|---------|--|
| 3 | At this study phase, financial sustainability of the outputs delivered does not really come into play. However, the feasibility studies assessed all parameters such as economic and financial viability of the project (the OSBPs) and concluded that once constructed, they can be financially sustainable . |

2. Institutional sustainability and strengthening of capacities

| Rating* | Narrative assessment (indicative max length: 250 words) |
|---------|--|
| 3 | At the level of the EA, SADC is fully sustainable as an institution coordinating regional integration projects, programmes and activities. However, as observed earlier in this PCR, it is highly important to ensure “project specific” financial and human capacity is available in order to achieve the desired outcomes. |

3. Ownership and sustainability of partnerships

| Rating* | Narrative assessment (indicative max length: 250 words) |
|---------|---|
| 4 | Most key ministries of government and institutions within the Ministry of Transport were actively engaged and involved during the implementation of the project. As national border operations have multiple stakeholders (customs, revenue officials, health, national security, agriculture etc.); these were all engaged and involved during the implementation and a lot of useful interactions and contributions were achieved as a result. Stakeholder information dissemination and consultations were also held by the study consultant to ensure that all stakeholders were apprised of the study developments, and feedback received. |

4. Environmental and social sustainability

| Rating* | Narrative assessment (indicative max length: 250 words) |
|---------|--|
| - | As this is a study, environmental and social sustainability does not apply, and will only come into play after the physical rehabilitation and modernisation projects- |

5. Lessons learned related to sustainability

| Key issues (max 5, add rows as needed) | Lessons learned | Target audience |
|--|--|-----------------|
| 1. Multi Stakeholder Participation | As implementation of OSBPs at national borders require the operational coordination of multiple stakeholders (customs, revenue officials, health, national security, agriculture etc.), it is important to | RMCs |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | sustain the joint working committees normally set up during execution, even beyond the completion of the project, and to replicate lessons from one specific OSBP to others within the countries. | |
| | | |

III Performance of stakeholders

- Bank performance

| Rating* | Narrative assessment by the Borrower on the Bank's performance, as well as any other aspects of the project (both quantitative and qualitative). See guidance note on issues to cover. (indicative max length: 250 words) | |
|--|---|--|
| 3 | <p>Borrower's assessment of Bank's performance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Bank / NEPAD-IPPF processed the recipient requests (for disbursement, No objection, etc.) in line with the Letter of Agreement relating to the NEPAD-IPPF grant. The Bank performed field supervision missions. However, some crucial impediments to the implementation of funded activities were not adequately anticipated. | |
| <p>Comments to be inserted by the Bank on its own performance (both quantitative and qualitative). See guidance note on issues to cover. (indicative max length: 250 words)</p> <p>Multinational operations are complex in nature, especially as was the case in the project where SADC Secretariat played the Executing Agency role on behalf of 3 countries, but without adequate financial and human resources needed to do a thorough job.</p> <p>As required in the design of such project, the Bank left sufficient leeway to the Executing Agency SADC Secretariat and its Member Countries to determine their satisfaction with the progress and quality of work being delivered. This resulted in delays referred to above and ultimately to the termination of the consultants contract. Despite the Bank's numerous communications of concern with the progress of implementation of the studies, the end result was still an unsatisfactory one and perhaps a stronger position by the Bank would have helped.</p> <p>Most of these concerns have been addressed through implementation of PD05/2015 on cancellation of operations, which in turn are ensuring a stricter approach to monitoring and client responsiveness to projects.</p> | | |
| Key issues (related to Bank performance, max 5, add rows as needed) | | Lessons learned |
| Supervision and Monitoring | | Need for stricter supervision and monitoring of multinational projects, and applying stricter sanctions or actions on poorly performing projects |

- Borrower performance

| Rating* | Narrative assessment on the Borrower performance to be inserted by the Bank (both quantitative and qualitative, depending on available information). See guidance note. (indicative max length: 250 words) | |
|--|--|------------------------|
| 2 | <p>The performance of SADC Secretariat in this project was rather unsatisfactory in ensuring overall project management and coordination with its Member Countries. Sufficient resources could have been made available for management of this project, and a tougher stance towards the consultants for poor performance, way before termination was activated.</p> <p>Overall, their responsiveness and submission of quarterly progress reports was also often untimely, resulting in time slippages and ultimately to the cancellation of the Grant.</p> | |
| Key issues (related to Borrower performance, max 5, add rows as needed) | | Lessons learned |
| | | |

- Performance of other stakeholders

| Rating* | Narrative assessment on the performance of other stakeholders, including co-financiers, contractors and service providers. See guidance note on issues to cover. (indicative max length: 250 words) |
|---------|--|
| 1 | <p>Consultants: The Consultants recruited for the assignment were Otieno Odongo & Partners Consulting Engineers.</p> <p>Despite their many years of experience in engineering consulting work in Africa, the consultants' approach to the assignment and performance left a lot to be desired. None of the required outputs were delivered on time and even when they were submitted, they were often lacking in quality resulting in the clients having to request regular improvements. Site visits for data collection and stakeholder consultations were not being undertaken on time often citing lack of responsiveness from the RMCs which was not always justifiable. This led to conclusions that the firm were not adequately experienced in this particular type of work, and that although they had proposed personnel with acceptable qualifications and experience, they were not readily and consistently committed to the assignment leading to excessive slippages in the delivery schedule. Overall rates unsatisfactory.</p> |

IV Summary of key lessons learned and recommendations

1. Key lessons learned

| Key issues (max 5, add rows as needed) | Key lessons learned | Target audience |
|--|--|---|
| 1. Implementation arrangements | <p>Despite that the implementation arrangements as designed with SADC Secretariat to coordinate the studies and consensus building with the 3 Member countries; the actual implementation proved problematic as SADC Secretariat had not allocated sufficient budget and a dedicated person within its Infrastructure Directorate to ensure an effective delivery of this role. Additionally, as the contribution to the project from the Member Countries was to be own resources for participation in validation meetings and workshops as well as for review and clearance of reports, it proved to be problematic for all the 3 countries to meet timely and as required often times due to unavailability of funds and key people required at specific times. As a result, implementation progress was significantly affected leading to significant delays in the delivery schedule.</p> <p>Key lesson is to allocate a dedicated budget and assign specific individuals to be charged with the responsibility of pushing progress on the project.</p> | Executing Agency (SADC) and the Bank |
| 2. Counterpart funding | Need to ensure resource planned for Member Countries review a validation of outputs are set assigned and/or ring fenced to ensure their availability when required during execution of the project | Executing Agency (SADC) the Bank and RMCs |
| 2. Performance OF Service Provider - the Consultants engaged for the services. | Need to vet consultants competencies relevant to the assignment at hand very carefully to ensure their capability and continuous availability of key personnel to deliver according to the delivery schedule | Executing Agency (SADC) and the Bank |
| | | |
| | | |

2. Key recommendations (with particular emphasis on ensuring sustainability of project benefits)

| Key issue (max 10, add rows as needed) | Key recommendation | Responsible | Deadline |
|--|--|-------------|--|
| 1. Multi Stakeholder Participation | As implementation of OSBPs at national borders require the operational coordination of multiple stakeholders (customs, revenue officials, health, national security, agriculture etc.), it is important to sustain the joint working | RMCs | Arrangements to be in place before conclusion of preparatory studies |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | committees normally set up during execution, even beyond the completion of the project, and to replicate lessons from one specific OSBP to others within the countries. | | |
|--|---|--|--|

V Overall PCR rating

| Dimensions and criteria | Rating* |
|---|-------------|
| DIMENSION A: RELEVANCE | 4.00 |
| Relevance of project development objective (II.A.1) | 4 |
| Relevance of project design (II.A.2) | 4 |
| DIMENSION B: EFFECTIVENESS | 4.00 |
| Development Objective (DO) (II.B.4) | 4 |
| DIMENSION C: EFFICIENCY | 1 |
| Timeliness (II.C.1) | 1 |
| Resource use efficiency (II.C.2) | 1 |
| Cost-benefit analysis (II.C.3) | - |
| Implementation Progress (IP) (II.C.4) | 1 |
| DIMENSION D: SUSTAINABILITY | 2.00 |
| Financial sustainability (II.D.1) | 2 |
| Institutional sustainability and strengthening of capacities (II.D.2) | 2 |
| Ownership and sustainability of partnerships (II.D.3) | 2 |
| Environmental and social sustainability (II.D.4) | - |
| AVERAGE OF THE DIMENSION RATINGS | |
| OVERALL PROJECT COMPLETION RATING | 2.75 |

VI Acronyms and abbreviations

| Acronym (add rows as needed) | Full name |
|------------------------------|--|
| AfDB | African Development Bank |
| D/D | Detailed Engineering Design |
| EA | Executing Agency |
| EIRR | Economic Internal Rate of Return |
| EUR | Euro |
| FS | Feasibility Study |
| IP | Implementation Progress |
| IPR | Implementation Progress Results Report |
| JICA | Japan International Cooperation Agency |
| JSC | Joint Steering Committee |
| JTC | Joint Technical Committee |
| MoU | Memorandum of Understanding |
| NEPAD-IPPF | New Partnership for Africa's Development – Infrastructure Project Preparation Fund |
| PAP | Project Affected Persons |
| PCR | Project Completion Report |
| PIU | Project Implementation Unit |
| OSBP | One Stop Border Post |
| TA | Technical Assistant |
| USD | United States Dollar |
| SADC | Southern Africa Development Community |
| GoM | Government of Malawi |
| GoMz | Government of Mozambique |
| GoZ | Government of Zambia |
| | |